REMARKS

In response to the Office Action mailed on March 20, 2008, Applicants respectfully requests reconsideration. Claims 1-22 and 31-50 are pending in this Application. Claims1, 17, 21, 37, 41 and 42 are independent claims and the remaining claims are dependent claims. In this Amendment, claim 50 has been amended. Applicants believe that the claims as presented are in condition for allowance. A notice to this affect is respectfully requested.

Claim 50 was rejected under 35 U.S.C.§112, second paragraph, as having a term lacking antecedent basis. Claim 50 has been amended to correct this. Accordingly, this rejection is believed to have been overcome.

Claims 1-17, 21-22, 31-37, 41-42 and 44 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Publication No. 2004/0075680 to Grace et al. (hereinafter Grace) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,271,845 to Richardson (hereinafter Richardson).

Claim 1 recites in part "…receiving selection of multiple entries in a hierarchy, he selection including multiple managed entities in a network…" and "… continuing to display the drill down menu even after producing the drilldown view for selection of another drill down option from the drill down menu and further drilling down with respect to the produced drill down view." The Examiner stated that Grace does not teach or suggest such a limitation. However, the office action likens this element of the claimed invention to teachings found in Richardson. The office action further combines teachings of Richardson and Grace to reject claim 1 as being obvious.

Contrary to the assertion in the final office action that Richardson teaches the above claim limitation, Applicants respectfully submit that Richardson does not teach receiving selection of multiple entries in a hierarchy, or continuing to display the drill down menu even after producing the drilldown view for selection of another drill down option. For example, the office action recites Richardson at figure 4, item 82 and figure 5, item 102.

Applicants respectfully submit that this reference to an item in the drawing does not teach or suggest receiving selection of multiple entries in a hierarchy, or continuing to display the drill down menu even after producing the drilldown view for selection of another drill down option. Item 82 in figure 4 merely shows a GUI showing a variety of different icons, and fails to suggest selection of multiple entries in a hierarchy. Similarly, item 102 in Figure 5 merely shows a drop menu showing the user has selected to view "connections" for "netware performance" in a parent menu which fails to disclose or suggest continuing to display the drill down menu even after producing the drilldown view for selection of another drill down option from the drill down menu and further drilling down with respect to the produced drill down view. If the Examiner is to maintain this rejection he is asked to point out in detail where these claim elements are shown in the prior art, and not to just recite an element of a drawing with no further explanation.

Further, it is noted that the Office Action fails to specifically address even the expressly recited features of the pending independent or dependent claims. Under the Office's policy of compact prosecution, each claim should be reviewed for compliance with every statutory requirement for patentability in the initial review of the application, even if one or more claims are found to be deficient with respect to some statutory requirement. (MPEP §707.07(g)). It is submitted that the present application is not sufficiently informal, does not present an undue multiplicity of claims, or exhibit a misjoinder of inventions, so as to reasonably preclude a complete action on the merits. Thus, it is submitted that the Office's failure constitutes a failure to expeditiously provide the information necessary to resolve issues related to patentability that prevents the Applicants from, for example, presenting appropriate patentability arguments and/or rebuttal evidence. (See The Official Gazette Notice of November 7, 2003). Additionally, it is submitted that the Office's failure needlessly encourages piecemeal prosecution, which is to be avoided as much as possible. (MPEP §707.07(g)). Accordingly, in the event that the Office maintains the rejection of any of the independent or dependent claims, Applicants respectfully requests, in the

interests of compact prosecution, that the Office apply art against each feature of each rejected independent claim, on the record, and with specificity sufficient to support a prima facie case of anticipation.

Accordingly, claim 1 is believed allowable over the art of record. Claims 17, 21, 37, 41 and 42 contain similar language and are believed allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 1. Claims 2-16, 22, and 31-36 depend from claim 1 or 21 and are believed allowable as they depend from a base claim which is believed allowable. In view of the above, the Examiner's rejection of claims 1-17, 21-22, 31-37, 41-42 and 44 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Grace in view of Richardson is believed to have been overcome.

The Examiner rejected claims 18-20, 38-40, 43 and 45-50 under 35 U.S.C.103(a) as being unpatentable over Grace in view of Richardson and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,822,663 to Wang (hereinafter Wang). Claims 18-20, 38-40, 43 and 45-50 depend from claims 1, 17 or 37 and are believed allowable as they depend from a base claim which is believed allowable.

The Examiner stated that neither Grace nor Richardson teach or suggest discontinuing highlighting of a first selectable drill down option from a drill down menu to indicate that a first selectable drill down option can no longer be selected, which Applicants agree with. The Examiner then stated that Wang teaches this. Applicants submit that the combination of Wang with Richardson and Grace is improper. Wang relates to a transform rule generator for web-based markup languages, and is not remotely related to monitoring of a managed network (Richardson) nor displaying network fabric data (Grace). A person of reasonable skill in the are would not be motivated to look in the area of web-based markup languages for art related to monitoring of a managed network or displaying network fabric data. Recent court decisions (e.g., KSR) prohibit such a combination of unrelated art, as described below:

> As is clear from cases such as *Adams*, a patent composed of several elements is not proved obvious merely by demonstrating that each of its elements was, independently, known in the prior art. Although common sense directs one to look with care at a patent application that claims as innovation the combination of two known devices according to their established functions, it can be important to identify a reason

that would have prompted a person of ordinary skill in the relevant field to combine the elements in a way the claimed new invention does." *KSR*, 82 USPQ2d at 1396.

Accordingly, the rejection of claims 18-20, 38-40, 43 and 45-50 under 35 U.S.C.103(a) as being unpatentable over Grace in view of Richardson and further in view of Wang is believed to have been overcome.

In view of the above, the Examiner's objections and rejections are believed to have been overcome, placing the pending claims in condition for allowance and reconsideration and allowance thereof is respectfully requested.

Applicants hereby petitions for any extension of time which is required to maintain the pendency of this case. If there is a fee occasioned by this response, including an extension fee, that is not covered by an enclosed check, please charge any deficiency to Deposit Account No. 50-3735.

If the enclosed papers or fees are considered incomplete, the Patent Office is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned collect at (508) 616-9660, in Westborough, Massachusetts.

Respectfully submitted,

/DWR/

David W. Rouille, Esq.
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No.: 40,150
Chapin Intellectual Property Law, LLC
Westborough Office Park
1700 West Park Drive, Suite 280
Westborough, Massachusetts 01581
Telephone: (508) 616-9660
Facsimile: (508) 616-9661
Customer No.: 58408

Attorney Docket No.: EMC03-20(02068)

Dated: June 13, 2008